DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 017 SO 001 383

TITLE	Choosing a President, 1968: The American Political Process.
INSTITUTION	Tufts Univ., Medford, Mass. Lincoln Filene System for Citizenship and Public Affairs.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	65p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Activity Units, Citizenship, *Civics, *Elections, Learning Activities, Political Issues, *Political Science, Political Socialization, *Public Affairs Education, Secondary Grades, *Social Studies Units, Teaching Guides

ABSTRACT

The student text portion of this set contains an account of the 1968 presidential election, from the state primaries to the election of Richard M. Nixon. The Teacher's Guide outlines objectives, teaching strategies, discussion questions, vocabulary, and an annotated listing of resources which includes educational and commercial films as well as books. Teaching strategies suggested include a wide variety of learning activities, from precinct and campaign work to research projects. Among the cognitive objectives listed are understandings of: successful campaign techniques; the qualities of a successful politician; the role played by issues in an election; the role of party conventions; and, the role of bargaining among politicians, and "appreciation of the orderly and peaceful manner in which power changes hands in a democratic society." Psychomotor objectives are: participation as worker in a political campaign; increased reading about politics in newspapers and magazines; and, increased participation in school politics. It is strongly suggested that this, and any other unit on politics, be coordinated with some form of local or national election so that students will be able to participate directly in the political process. (JLB)

ED0 540017

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY JOHN S. GIBSON, HAROLD FILENE CE. TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

CHOOSING A PRESIDENT, 1968: THE AMERICAN POLITICAL PROCESS

SP 001 383

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts 02155

Copyright © The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs 1969
Tufts University

Preface

A military coup makes an air force general the dictator of a nation in Latin America. A king dies in a small European monarchy, and, with all the pomp and ceremony surrounding a royal coronation, his eldest son takes his place. Communist Party leaders, through highly secret maneuvers, select one of themselves to fill the position of Premier of the Soviet Union. The Labor Party wins a majority in the House of Commons, and chooses its leader to be Prime Minister of Great Britain.

Every nation state in the world has some political process by which it selects its national leaders. Some methods are violent; some are peaceful. In some nations leadership changes at regular intervals; in others one never knows exactly when new leaders will assume power.

The political process in the United States has been compared to a free-for-all, or a carnival. It is hardly peaceful, yet it is rarely violent. It has been criticized for selecting mediocre men to fill positions of great prestige and power. Every four years the American political process produces a President.

One such year was 1968. Men have argued, as they always have, whether the best man was elected. They have mourned assassinated leaders; they have despaired the violence that occurred in Chicago. But however they judge the results of election year 1968, Americans will be forced to conclude that, with all of its limitations, the American political process once again worked.

William G. Tapply

New Hampshire was bitterly cold in January, 1968. At dawn, when factory workers trudged through the snow to work, the temperature usually hovered around ten below zero. The men would lean against the wind, looking forward to the shelter of the factory.

In Nashua and in Manchester, the men entering the textile mills would be greeted by a large man with a cordial smile and an extended hand: "Hello. I'm George Romney, and I would like your vote as the Republican candidate for President." Governor Romney of Michigan was able to deal with the harsh New England winter. He wore thermal underwear. He carried hand warmers in each pocket of his topcoat.

Romney felt that to win a primary election he had to meet the voters. He traveled the length and breadth of the state in the "Romneymobile," averaging 200 miles a day, stopping wherever there were people. In Tuftonboro he might drop into a local restaurant to share a cup of coffee with the patrons and ask them for their votes. In Hanover he might address an assembly at Dartmouth College. In Concord he might visit officials at the state capitol. And in the industrial cities, where the population was concentrated, he repeated his lonely vigil at dawn, shaking a thousand hands and repeating his request for votes a thousand times.

The New Hampshire primary election would take place in March. George W. Romney realized that, even if he should win in New Hampshire, he would gain only

a few delegates from this sparsely populated New England state. Yet he continued, sometimes 18 or 20 hours a day, seeking votes. For he knew that, since the New Hampshire primary was the first in the nation, the results would be considered by Republican Party officials as an early indication of Romney's ability to win votes. And in August the Party, at its convention in Miami, would nominate the man who it felt could win the election. So Romney had more to win or lose than a handful of delegates who would go to Miami obligated to cast their votes for him as Republican nominee for President of the United States. Romney had to prove to his Party that he was a real candidate. A real candidate, in the eyes of the Party, was one who could win.

The New Hampshire voters who would use a Republican ballot in the March primary would have the choice between Governor Romney and Richard M. Nixon. Mr. Nixon waited at no factory gates in Nashua. He shook no hands in New Hampshire. But Nixon was running for the Republican Presidential nomination, and running hard. Unlike Romney, Nixon had been running for a long time. For years, whenever Republican leaders needed a speaker at a local Party function, Mr. Nixon would respond. When a local Republican Congressman was up for reelection, Nixon would fly in to make a speech in the candidate's favor. Just as Party leaders were watching Romney's progress in New Hampshire, so were they remembering the favors that Richard Nixon had done for them. When they all gathered in Miami, they would not forget those favors.

Mr. Nixon had the additional advantage of a national image. He had been Vice President for eight years under President Eisenhower. He had run for the Presidency against John F. Kennedy in 1960 and had nearly won. He had debated Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union. He had even exercised the powers of President briefly while President Eisenhower was recovering from a heart attack. He had also, of course, lost the election for Governor of California in 1962, and that was a major political setback for him. But he apparently had recovered well. So in spite of George Romney's presence in New Hampshire and in spite of two major political defeats, it surprised no one that the New Hampshire voters favored Richard Nixon. In January, in fact, the opinion polls showed that for every Republican voter who intended to vote for Romney, three favored Nixon. Romney had to change this preference for Nixon dramatically if he were to demonstrate that he was a candidate worth considering.

The New Hampshire voters did not have to vote for a Republican in the March primary. They could choose to vote for a member of the Democratic Party. The only name on the Democratic ballot as candidate for President would be that of Senator Eugene J. McCarthy of Minnesota. But most people felt that the favorite of the voters would be Lyndon B. Johnson, who was at that time President of the United States and who, everyone assumed, would eagerly seek reelection for that office. Although the President's name would not be on the New Hampshire ballot, his workers had mounted a campaign to encourage the voters to write in "Lyndon B. Johnson" instead of putting an "X" beside the name of Senator McCarthy.

Just as Nixon's national prominence made him the favorite among Republicans, so did Johnson's office make him appear almost unbeatable for the Democratic victory in New Hampshire. In fact, at the time he delivered his State of the Union Address in late January, President Johnson could count on the support of 73% of the Democratic voters in New Hampshire, if the opinion polls could be believed. But Eugene McCarthy had invaded the state with hordes of college students to help him campaign. McCarthy's volunteers had rallied to his outspoken criticism of the President's conduct of the Vietnam war. Over and over McCarthy repeated his cry: the Vietnam war is a disaster; President Johnson is to blame. Like Romney, McCarthy traveled all over the state, speaking to small gatherings wherever he could find them. Meanwhile his workers traveled from door to door to ask voters to support the Senator and his opposition to the war. McCarthy's dry wit and obvious sincerity appealed to many of the taciturn Granite Staters who heard him.

Still, when March arrived, the opinion polls did not encourage either McCarthy or Romney. President Johnson held an apparently insurmountable 6-1 lead over McCarthy. Nixon maintained a comfortable lead over Romney. In fact, the polls showed that New Hampshire Republicans actually favored Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York over the Michigan Governor. But Rockefeller had declared that he was not a candidate and had urged his supporters to vote for Romney.

Then, without any notice, George Romney gave up. He had made little progress, in spite of his long, cold hours of handshaking and speechmaking. He lagged

almost as far behind Nixon on the opinion polls as he had when he started. Experts felt that Romney's failure to take a clear-cut position on Vietnam was a major reason for his poor success. The strength of noncandidate Rockefeller also must have discouraged Romney. So he announced sadly that he was no longer a candidate: "It's clear to me that my candidacy has not won the wide acceptance with rank-and-file Republicans that I had hoped to achieve."

Many Republicans turned to Rockefeller. Would he now enter the race? Would he now stand up against Richard Nixon, with whom he disagreed on many major issues? "I am ready and willing to serve the American people if called," stated Nelson Rockefeller. But he refused to announce his candidacy. If the Party leaders wanted him, it was up to them to do something about it.

Many people hoped that the Party would. Headed by Spiro T. Agnew, Governor of Maryland, a draft-Rockefeller movement began. The support of prominent Republicans throughout the United States was sought. If they could all convince Rockefeller of his strength and popularity, perhaps he would formally declare his intention to run. But many Republicans would not support the New York Governor. He had violated a cardinal political rule in 1964 when he had refused to support the Party's nominee, Barry Goldwater. Many Republicans had never forgiven him. In addition, Party leaders recognized that a great number of Americans would not vote for Rockefeller because of his divorce and remarriage. A significant number of Republicans, of course, favored Richard Nixon, and for that reason they quite naturally opposed

Rockefeller's potentially strong candidacy. So, in the absence of firm and widespread support, Rockefeller remained a noncandidate.

As primary day in New Hampshire approached, President Johnson and Richard Nixon appeared to be headed for landslide victories. And when the ballots were counted after the March 12th voting, Nixon had indeed won 78% of the Republican votes. "We have won in New Hampshire," exulted Nixon, "and we are going to win in Miami."

But the results of the Democratic primary shocked and surprised the nation. The upset staged by Senator McCarthy turned the Democratic Party upside down. Instead of being humiliated by overwhelming write-in votes for President Johnson, McCarthy polled 42% of the vote, almost as much as the 48% President Johnson received. Running against an incumbent President, McCarthy's performance was considered a major victory. President Johnson, it seemed, could be beaten. He was not popular enough to win the votes of a majority of the Democrats in New Hampshire. Moreover, McCarthy's showing seemed to indicate that large numbers of people shared his opposition to the Vietnam war. Suddenly the President was in trouble. The Presidential nomination of the Democratic Party was up for grabs.

One man perceived this situation very clearly. Senator Robert F. Kennedy, brother of the late President John F. Kennedy, decided to reconsider his previous decision not to challenge President Johnson in 1968. Like McCarthy, Kennedy was an outspoken critic of the war in Vietnam. Like McCarthy, Kennedy enjoyed the support of large numbers of young people. Kennedy could also count on the support

of many minority groups throughout the country, especially the Negro community. But he had been advised against running for the nomination. Then the news from New Hampshire arrived.

On Saturday, March 16th, Senator Kennedy called a press conference in the Senate Caucus Room, the same room where, eight years earlier, his brother had announced his intention to run for the Presidency. With his wife, Ethel, and nine of the ten Kennedy children seated beside him, Robert Kennedy declared that he would seek the Democratic nomination for President. "The fight is just beginning," he stated, "and I believe that I can win." He said that he would urge his workers in Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, where it was too late for Kennedy to enter the primaries, to support Senator McCarthy, with whom Kennedy agreed on most issues. He made it clear, however, that he would oppose McCarthy in the primaries in Nebraska, Oregon and California: "I am not asking anyone to hand anything to me. I am not asking anyone to give anything to me. I am going to the people, and I am going to make an effort, and I think it is worthwhile."

Senator Kennedy asserted that he was not running so much <u>against</u> the President as he was running <u>for</u> the idea of change. "I do not run for the Presidency merely to oppose any man, but to propose new policies. I run because I am convinced that this country is on a perilous course."

Meanwhile McCarthy backers grumbled that Kennedy was an "opportunist." He would not have entered the race at all, they felt, had not Senator McCarthy demonstrated that President Johnson could be beaten. In spite of the similarity of their

positions on most issues, a good deal of hostility existed between the two Senators who wanted to be President.

So Robert Kennedy's campaign was under way. He quickly gathered around him the old hands from John Kennedy's successful campaign. Pierre Salinger, Kenneth O'Donnell, and Theodore Sorenson joined forces again with hopes of repeating 1960's success.

President Johnson's poor showing in New Hampshire had encouraged Robert Kennedy to challenge him. By the same token, however, the overwhelming victory of Richard Nixon discouraged possible challengers from opposing him. Nelson Rockefeller, who had been wavering, stated publicly, "I have decided today to reiterate unequivocally that I am not a candidate campaigning directly or indirectly for the Presidency of the United States." It appeared that Rockefeller had dealt himself permanently out of the Republican campaign. The announcement surprised few people.

On Sunday evening, March 31st, President Johnson was scheduled to deliver an address on nationwide television regarding the Vietnam war. Mr. Johnson surprised and pleased many Americans when he declared that the United States would cease, at least for the time, the bombing raids on North Vietnam. This move, the President hoped, would encourage the parties involved in the war to seek a peaceful settlement. Many Americans, however, felt that President Johnson had made this decision in order to enhance his own popularity and thereby increase his chances of being nominated again by his Party for the Presidency.

This interpretation was immediately shattered. The President paused in his speech and gazed directly into the television cameras. Slowly he spoke: "I shall not seek, and I will not accept, the nomination of my party for another term as your President."

Suddenly the entire campaign had changed. It appeared that Robert Kennedy and Eugene McCarthy would slug it out for the Democratic nomination, although many supporters of the Administration began to speak of Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey's entering the race. Now Richard Nixon was not only the favorite to win the Republican nomination, but to many experts he also seemed to the best bet to win the Presidential election.

The scene of the next primary of importance was Wisconsin. Robert Kennedy had entered the race too late to get his name on the ballot, but Eugene McCarthy spent more than $400,000 in Wisconsin, mostly for television appearances. His efforts paid off in a substantial 57% of the Democratic vote. President Johnson, his name still on the ballot, received 35%, which many people judged to be "sympathy" votes or votes in support of the President's new war policies.

When Democrats grew tired of discussing President Johnson's decision not to run, they began to consider the probability that Vice President Humphrey would soon declare his candidacy. Opinion polls showed that the President's popularity had soared since his announcement, and it seemed certain that Humphrey, more than anyone else, stood to benefit from the increased public favor of the Johnson Administration. Still, Humphrey hesitated to declare himself a candidate until he should receive the blessing of the President.

On April 27th, however, Hubert Humphrey officially announced his candidacy. Like Nixon, Humphrey had the advantage of knowing leaders of his Party across the nation. As one insider put it, "Every party leader in the country is indebted to him. He's been at so many chicken dinners that if just those chickens come home to roost, he's got the nomination."

Since the late 1940's, Hubert Humphrey had been a leading liberal in the Senate. His courage and idealism were widely respected, even among his opponents. But from 1964 to 1968 he had been obscured by Lyndon Johnson's large shadow. The Vice President of the United States always plays second fiddle to the President. This is especially so when the President happens to be a Lyndon B. Johnson. Humphrey himself recognized this problem and stated, "The trouble is, I haven't had much public image. It has just vanished." The first order of business for the Humphrey campaign, then, would be to rebuild his image. The themes of his campaign were unity and optimism. Humphrey's campaign came to be known as the "politics of joy."

Meanwhile Governor Rockefeller began to show signs that he was unhappy with the status of noncandidate. Although he refused to challenge Richard Nixon openly, he let it be known that he might be persuaded to run if there were a genuine draft by his Party. More and more Rockefeller put himself in the public eye. Finally, on the eve of the Massachusetts primary election, he became a full-fledged candidate: "I frankly find that to comment from the sidelines is not an effective way to present the alternatives."

For weeks Massachusetts Republicans had been waging an energetic campaign to win write-in votes for Rockefeller. The only Republican whose name would appear on the ballot was that of Governor John A. Volpe. A vote for Volpe, everyone knew, was a vote for Richard Nixon, since Volpe, who originally had favored Governor Rockefeller, had by this time clearly stated his support for Nixon. While Senator McCarthy was winning the Massachusetts Democratic primary as expected, Nelson Rockefeller pulled a major upset by narrowly beating Volpe. Rarely does a write-in candidate outpoll a candidate listed on the ballot. The significance of this victory for Rockefeller was not lost on the Republican Party. Perhaps Richard Nixon was not invincible after all.

Democratic leaders began to look to the Indiana primary with great excitement. Here, for the first time, Robert Kennedy's popular strength would be tested as he came face to face with Eugene McCarthy. Indiana Governor Roger D. Branigan, a staunch supporter of the Johnson Administration, was also on the ballot. A strong showing by Branigan would indicate potential strength for Hubert Humphrey, whose popularity had steadily risen since he had declared his candidacy.

Among Republicans, Nixon was alone on the Indiana ballot. He won easily against a handful of write-in candidates. When the Democratic votes were counted, Robert Kennedy emerged with a major victory. His appeal to minority groups and to urban dwellers was demonstrated beyond question. In Indiana, too, Kennedy showed that he was willing to spend large sums of money on television and newspaper publicity. Branigan commented flatly, "I got whipped. I got taken to the woodshed."

Senator McCarthy, on the other hand, claimed that he had done well. If Branigan had not been on the ballot, asserted McCarthy, he would have beaten Kennedy.

To a wildly cheering crowd, Senator Kennedy commented on his victory: "Senator McCarthy says it's just another step in a series of steps, and this isn't a defeat /for him/. Well . . . I don't know whether people think it's so good to be second or third. That's not the way I was brought up. I always was taught that it is much better to win. I learned that when I was about two."

While Vice President Humphrey continued to preach the "politics of joy," Senator Kennedy went on rolling up primary victories. First in Washington, D.C., then in Nebraska, the young Senator from New York demonstrated his popularity. Eugene McCarthy's star, it appeared, had begun to fall.

A major confrontation between the two Senators would occur in Oregon in May. Both McCarthy and Kennedy campaigned long and hard there, for each considered a victory in the primary in Oregon to be essential. A defeat for McCarthy would just about destroy any chance that remained for him to win the Democratic nomination in Chicago. If Kennedy should lose, it would give a great boost to those Humphrey supporters who claimed that Kennedy's popularity was really limited to urban centers and certain minority groups.

When Kennedy saw the returns from Oregon, he sadly declared it "a setback . . . which I could ill afford." McCarthy had beaten him, 45% to 39%. Both Senators now looked to the upcoming California primary as their last chance.

For the Republicans, meanwhile, it had become increasingly clear that Richard Nixon could not be stopped. In Oregon he had amassed the impressive total of 73% of the Republican votes, while write-in candidates Ronald Reagan and Nelson Rockefeller could pull only 23% and 4% respectively. "We are not going to be stopped," boasted Nixon, and few people could argue with him.

Ronald Reagan, the conservative Governor of California, had let it be known for some time that, if enough support appeared to exist, he would consider becoming a candidate for the Presidency. But he had steadfastly declined to announce his candidacy. Southern Republicans found Reagan's conservative approach to many major issues of the day more appealing than the positions taken by the Republicans who might have a chance for the Party's nomination. Reagan's supporters had worked hard and long in Oregon to drum up write-in votes, hoping that, with a good showing there, the Governor would formally announce his candidacy. When the returns were counted in Oregon, Reagan was asked if he were unhappy with receiving 23% of the vote. "Heavens, no," he replied. "I am honored beyond words. . . . I'd be grateful if one person outside my immediate family thought that highly of me." But Reagan knew that Nixon was in the driver's seat. Both he and Nelson Rockefeller had to reassess the strength of their challenges to Richard Nixon.

Among the Democrats, Humphrey appeared to be riding high, although he had entered the race too late to enter any primaries. After Senator Kennedy's defeat in Oregon, many observers felt that Kennedy and McCarthy would knock each other off,

leaving the way clear for Humphrey. This interpretation was confirmed when a majority of the Pennsylvania delegation to the Democratic convention pledged itself to support Humphrey. In the Florida primary election, favorite son Senator George A. Smathers, a stand-in for Humphrey, won convincingly. Then endorsements for the Humphrey candidacy began to pour in from many important labor groups across the nation. The California primary election loomed ever larger for both Kennedy and McCarthy. They would be fighting there for their political lives against Humphrey.

The California primary is perhaps the most important one in any election year. It is the last primary before the conventions. California is one of the most heavily populated states in the nation, and the delegations to the conventions are correspondingly large. It is a state that contains almost all elements politicians must appeal to: urban areas, minority groups, liberals and conservatives. Following immediately upon the heels of the Oregon primary, a victory in California was an absolute must for both Kennedy and McCarthy. Both men had had their workers in California for months trying to increase their popular support for the primary on June 4th.

Americans waited intently for the results from California. Could Kennedy rebound from his Oregon defeat? Would McCarthy win again and establish beyond question the strength of his already surprising candidacy?

By 1:00 a.m. on June 5th, the results were certain: Senator Robert Kennedy had won. He had established that he was a serious contender, a real challenge to Vice President Humphrey. Kennedy's boyish face appeared on national television,

his famous grin revealing his elation at his victory. Never had he been more confident that he could win the Democratic nomination in Chicago and then the Presidency in the November election. "I think we can end the divisions within the United States. What I think is quite clear is that we can work together. . . . We are a great country, a selfless . . . and a compassionate country. . . . So my thanks to all of you, and on to Chicago and let's win."

With those words, Kennedy left the podium. He would not get far, for just around the corner an assassin waited. A quick burst of shots, screams, a confusion of noises and people, and Robert F. Kennedy lay dying on the floor. Once again a senseless act of violence had taken a human life. Once again the American political process, usually so proudly peaceful and orderly, had been violently disrupted by an assassin's bullet.

Briefly, all politics ceased as friend and foe joined together to mourn. For a time, the thought of partisan competition seemed crude, even disgusting, to the public and to politicians alike.

Eventually, however, politics had to resume. The Party conventions would not wait, nor would the November election. Democrats began to talk of Edward M. Kennedy, Senator from Massachusetts and brother of the late Robert Kennedy, as a possible candidate. But Ted Kennedy's grief was too great for him to consider such a thought. The polls showed that, as the summer wore on, Humphrey and Nixon were steadily widening their respective leads as favorites to win their respective Party's nominations.

In early August, Republican delegates from every state in the nation began to arrive in Miami Beach to choose their Party's nominee for President. Many delegates were obligated by the results of their states' primary elections to cast their votes for the primary victor. Other delegates had pledged their votes to one of the candidates. Many delegates had not, at least formally, committed themselves. Nixon would win, the experts guaranteed. But Nelson Rockefeller and Ronald Reagan hoped to upset the predictions. They arrived early and met with state delegations.

A scant 48 hours before the balloting was scheduled to begin, Reagan announced, "As of this moment I am a candidate." He and his supporters met repeatedly with Southern delegations. If he could control the Southern states, he might prevent a Nixon victory on the first ballot. Rockefeller, meanwhile, appealed to the liberal wing of the Party. Both men had the same thought: deny Nixon the 667 first-ballot votes needed for victory, pick up more votes on the second and third ballots, and Nixon would fall out of the running.

While the Platform Committee drew up a statement of the position of the Republican Party on the issues of the day, the candidates labored behind the scenes to accumulate votes. Nixon and his workers hoped to win a majority on the first ballot. Rockefeller and Reagan worked to deprive Nixon of that majority.

When the balloting began on Wednesday evening, August 14th, three things gradually became clear. First, Ronald Reagan's Southern strategy had failed. Nixon had the support of Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, and Thurmond's influence among the Southern delegations was vast. In effect, Thurmond had ordered

delegations from such states as Mississippi, Florida and South Carolina to hold firm for Nixon. They did.

A second fact appeared. Nelson Rockefeller had always fared well as a potential candidate for the Presidency on the Roper and the Harris polls of American public opinion. But he did not fare as well among the Republican delegates. The delegates did not share the general public's enthusiasm for the New York Governor.

Third, Richard Nixon's campaign had been a masterpiece of planning and organization. He and his workers had left no stone unturned. When the balloting ended, Nixon had rolled up 692 votes, comfortably more than the required 667, and won easily. Governor Reagan himself moved to make it unanimous.

Richard Nixon's victory in Miami surprised no one. He did, however, have a surprise for political observers. Traditionally the nominee for Vice President is the choice of the Presidential nominee. Although the Vice Presidential candidate, just like the Presidential candidate, must be nominated officially by a roll-call vote of states, the Presidential candidate lets it be known whom he wants, and the convention obediently nominates that man.

In 1968 the Republican Party had nominated for President a man with whom the liberals in the Party were not entirely happy. Perhaps Nixon would choose a more liberal man as a running mate, someone such as Mayor John Lindsay of New York City or even Governor Romney. Others thought that Nixon might prefer someone who agreed with him essentially on the major issues of the day, someone more

moderate than liberal. Governor Volpe of Massachusetts appeared to be in the running. Or Nixon might express his gratitude to Senator Thurmond, who had held the South for the nominee, by choosing him as the Vice Presidential candidate.

Nixon's choice surprised many. Spiro T. Agnew, Governor of Maryland, was a man with very little political experience and virtually no national image. In addition, he had been one of Nelson Rockefeller's early supporters and had jumped on the Nixon bandwagon only when it appeared certain that Rockefeller had no chance. The Party liberals were not happy with Nixon's choice. Agnew had acquired the unfortunate reputation of being unsympathetic to Negro problems. He was not considered to be a skillful politician.

But he was the candidate's choice, and he was duly nominated by the delegates. The liberals staged a mild rebellion by nominating George Romney, but Agnew's 1, 128 votes overwhelmed Romney's 186. It was a Nixon-Agnew ticket for the Republicans in 1968.

In his acceptance speech to the convention, Richard Nixon discussed some of the important issues that he felt were confronting the United States:

> As we look at America, we see cities enveloped in smoke and flame. We hear sirens in the night. We see Americans dying on distant battlefields abroad. We see Americans hating each other; killing each other at home.
>
> And as we see and hear these things, millions of Americans cry out in anguish: did we come all this way for this? . . .
>
> And this is their answer, and this is my answer to that question: when the strongest nation in the world can be tied down for four years in a war in Vietnam with no end

in sight, when the richest nation in the world can't manage its own economy, when the nation with the greatest tradition of the rule of law is plagued by unprecedented lawlessness, when a nation that has been known for a century for equality of opportunity is torn by unprecedented racial violence . . . then it's time for new leadership for the United States of America. . . .

We've had enough of big promises and little action. . . .

And I pledge to you tonight that the first priority foreign-policy objective of our next Administration will be to bring an honorable end to the war in Vietnam.

We shall not stop there. We need a policy to prevent more Vietnams. All of America's peace-keeping institutions and all of America's foreign commitments must be reappraised. . . .

And I say to you tonight that when respect for the United States of America falls so low that a fourth-rate military power like Korea will seize an American naval vessel in the high seas, it's time for new leadership to restore respect for the United States of America. . . .

And tonight it's time for some honest talk about the problem of order in the United States. Let us always respect, as I do, our courts and those who serve on them, but let us also recognize that some of our courts in their decisions have gone too far in weakening the peace forces as against the criminal forces in this country. . . .

And if we are to restore order and respect for law in this country, there's one place we're going to begin: we're going to have a new Attorney General of the United States of America. . . .

For the past five years we have been deluged by government programs for the unemployed, programs for the cities, programs for the poor, and we have reaped from

> these programs an ugly harvest of frustrations, violence and failure across the land. . . . To put it bluntly, we're on the wrong road and it's time to take a new road to progress. . . .

Nixon also talked about the American dream, in which nothing is impossible, and he talked about a boy:

> He hears a train go by. At night he dreams of faraway places where he'd like to go. It seems like an impossible dream. But he is helped on his journey through life. A father who had to go to work before he finished the sixth grade sacrificed everything he had so that his sons could go to college. A gentle Quaker mother with a passionate concern for peace quietly wept when he went to war but she understood why he had to go. . . . A courageous wife and loyal children stood by him in victory and also in defeat. And in his chosen profession of politics, first there were scores, then hundreds, then thousands, and finally millions who worked for his success.
>
> And tonight he stands before you, nominated for President of the United States of America.

The convention in Miami Beach had been quiet and predictable. If the Agnew nomination had been a surprise, it had been no shock. The delegates acted as they were supposed to act, and they nominated the man they were expected to nominate. The Republican Party emerged with the image of a well-oiled machine, highly disciplined, orderly, efficient.

The nation's political attention shifted now to the Democratic convention in Chicago, where many people anticipated some excitement. Hubert Humphrey would probably be nominated in the end, but the Democrats had a way of putting on a show. The Chicago police had been preparing all summer for possible antiwar demonstrations.

A group of young radicals called yippies had already announced their intention to invade Chicago to demonstrate their opposition to the Johnson Administration. They would, they said, hold their own convention in Chicago. They would nominate a pig for President.

Other protesters would be there, too. All vowed to force the nation's attention to the war in Vietnam, which they felt to be horrible, senseless, bloody, and the responsibility of the Democratic Party that had made Lyndon Johnson the American President.

Chicago's Mayor Richard J. Daley swore that his city would not be smeared by disorder or unpatriotic behavior. A loyal Democrat, Daley did not want the Party's name soiled, either. His police would be ready.

By August 26th, the day the Democratic convention began, thousands of non-delegates had swarmed into Chicago to join the two thousand plus convention delegates and alternates. Inside the convention hall, the tone was quickly set as the Platform Committee tried to reach agreement on an official Party position on the Vietnam war. The majority of the Committee insisted that the Vietnam plank should mirror faithfully the position of the Johnson Administration. But a large and outspoken minority, composed mostly of McCarthy delegates plus former Kennedy supporters, demanded that the Party platform condemn the war. The minority report was read for the platform to be voted on and accepted by the convention. Demonstrations broke out among the delegates. The nation, watching on television, saw a divided Democratic Party. It saw a large number of Democrats who obviously and violently opposed the policies

of a Democratic President. It saw a two-hour debate on the issue. And in the end, it saw the Democratic Party endorse its President's policy.

But the main business of the convention was to choose a Presidential nominee. Since Robert Kennedy's assassination, Hubert Humphrey appeared unbeatable. Still, Eugene McCarthy hoped to stage an upset. Senator George McGovern of South Dakota, a favorite of the Kennedy forces, made a last-minute declaration of his candidacy. Talk of drafting Ted Kennedy persisted, but the brother of the late Senator refused even to appear at the convention, and he gave no encouragement to his supporters.

As expected, a good deal of excitement was generated during the convention. Many Democrats outspokenly challenged their Party leaders. They openly criticized President Johnson for his war policies. Convention Chairman Carl Albert was frequently ignored when he tried to gavel the delegates back to order. A film in memory of Robert Kennedy produced a spontaneous singing of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic" by the delegates, who refused to be hushed. Julian Bond, a 28-year-old Negro from Georgia, was nominated for Vice President as a protest candidate. Indeed, the Presidential candidate's choice of the relatively unknown Senator Edmund Muskie of Maine for Vice President surprised many.

Less surprising was the choice of candidate for President. Hubert Humphrey, as expected, won easily on the first ballot. Eugene McCarthy, in spite of his hordes of youthful aides and enthusiastic supporters, could not do much to eat into Humphrey's lead. McGovern's candidacy made very little headway.

While the battles inside the hall were interesting, the battles in the streets of Chicago completely captured the horrified attention of the nation. As the lines were drawn, the Chicago police and the National Guard faced a motley collection of hippies, yippies, students, casual observers, and even, at the end, press photographers and television reporters. Before the week had ended, more than 700 civilians and 83 police had been injured, and 653 persons had been jailed. Television cameras captured the drama and relayed it to Americans nationwide. Demonstrators chanting "Dump the Hump" and "Disarm the Pigs" and carrying Vietcong flags, marched through Chicago streets by torchlight toward the Hilton Hotel, where the delegates were housed. Americans saw, too, Chicago police charge into the crowd screaming, "Kill 'em, kill 'em." They saw police opening bloody wounds on the heads of innocent bystanders. They saw teenage girls dragged by their feet to the police wagons. They saw a bearded young man lying in the street, with a big policeman standing over him repeatedly hitting him around the head with his night stick.

Even in the convention hall itself, the force of Mayor Daley's police was felt. Mike Wallace, a television reporter, was beaten by a policeman and dragged off the convention floor. A young delegate from New Hampshire, an outspoken critic of the Johnson Administration, was arrested. As the convention drew to a close, some policemen barged into the hotel headquarters of Senator McCarthy and arrested a number of his workers, charging that they had been throwing objects from the windows.

The behavior of the police appalled many Americans. "Police brutality," it was called. Others asserted that such force was necessary to curb the kind of disorder that existed in Chicago. Law and order had become a major national issue, one that the Presidential candidates could not ignore. Hubert Humphrey, in his acceptance speech, acknowledged this when he declared, "May America tonight resolve that never, never again shall we see what we have seen." He pleaded for unity and hope: "Believe in what America can do and . . . can be. With the help of the vast, unfrightened . . . majority of Americans . . . I am ready to lead our country."

But in the eyes of many, Humphrey's chances looked dim. The September opinion polls showed Nixon with a commanding lead. The Democratic convention had done immense damage to the Party's public image. It was a divided Party. It was, in the eye of the public, the Party of war. It was a Party in which Abraham A. Ribicoff would accuse Mayor Daley on national television of "Gestapo tactics," and the cameras would catch Daley mouthing an ugly obscenity back at him. It was a Party whose most popular potential candidate of all, Edward Kennedy, would not even attend the convention. It was a Party which had chosen as its Presidential candidate a man so closely tied to the Administration's Vietnam war that the unpopularity of that war had to rub off on him.

After the conventions, the focus of the campaign shifted from winning delegates, and thereby the Party nomination, to winning electoral votes and thereby the Presidency. Richard Nixon appeared to be a shoo-in. A scant week after the Democratic delegates had departed from Chicago, Nixon appeared there. Huge noontime

crowds estimated to be as large as 400,000, greeted him. Confetti drifted down upon his open car as he stood, arms upstretched, with both hands making the "V" sign for victory. "I would have to say that I have received the greatest political reception that I have ever received in my life in Chicago," he declared happily. The contrast between Nixon's welcome and the nightmare of the Democratic convention was dramatic.

Hubert Humphrey, meanwhile, struggled to put that nightmare into perspective. On a balance, he seemed sympathetic with the police. "Is there any wonder that the police had to take action?" he asked. "I regret the violence but I think the blame ought to be where it belongs." On another occasion, however, Humphrey seemed to agree more with the critics of the police. "There were hundreds and hundreds and thousands of young people who came there that just wanted to parade, just wanted to chant," he said. "I believe the Chicago police became weary, they became tired. They did overreact."

While Humphrey tried to explain Chicago and while Nixon reaped the benefits of Chicago, another man, also with eyes on the Presidency, perhaps was benefiting the most. George C. Wallace, former Governor of Alabama, had been running for President all year. Once a Democrat, he had decided to form a one-man third Party, the American Independent Party, to challenge the candidates of the two major Parties. His campaign up until now had been aimed at collecting enough signatures on petitions to get his name on the ballots of all the states. It appeared that he would succeed.

Wallace had acquired national recognition as a symbol of racial segregation. He had dramatically opposed the integration of public schools in Alabama, in spite of the ruling of the United States Supreme Court. He said that the states should have the right to decide such questions for themselves, without interference from the Federal government.

Increasingly in 1968, George Wallace had grown to symbolize the wishes and fears of the Americans who did not understand and did not like hippies and Negroes and bureaucrats. Increasingly, the candidates of the major Parties feared that Wallace would garner enough support to deny either Nixon or Humphrey a majority of the electoral votes. If such were the case, the election would be decided in the House of Representatives. This was the "constitutional crisis" about which many people whispered. To George Wallace, it was a desirable objective. "We gonna shake 'em up good in November," he was fond of predicting.

Wallace had a way of awakening the fears and hatreds of the crowds he addressed. Did the people fail to understand the bigness and complexity of the Federal government? Wallace had an answer: "Well, when I get to be President, I'm gonna call in a bunch of bureaucrats and take away their briefcases and throw 'em in the Potomac River. . . . " Did the people think hippies and demonstrators unpatriotic? Wallace did. "And if any demonstrator ever lays down in front of my car, it'll be the last car he'll ever lay down in front of. . . ." Were the people confused by policies created and explained by university professors? George Wallace

was. "We gonna show 'em in November that the average American is sick and tired of all these overeducated ivory-tower folks with pointed heads lookin' down their noses at you and me."

Especially, Wallace appealed to the widespread fears that Americans had acquired in the wake of two summers of urban riots, fears that had been aroused to a fever pitch by the disorder in Chicago. This was the simple fear of who the next victim might be, the feeling that the government had failed in its duty to protect the innocent, law-abiding citizen, that it had coddled the criminal, that it had handcuffed its police. George Wallace declared that, were he President, law and order would once again reign. "If we were President today," he declared over and over, "you wouldn't get stabbed or raped in the shadow of the White House, even if we had to call out 30,000 troops and equip them with two-foot-long bayonets and station them every few feet apart. . . . If you walk out of this hotel tonight and someone knocks you on the head, he'll be out of jail before you're out of the hospital and on Monday morning they'll try the policeman instead of the criminal. . . . That's right, we gonna have a police state for folks who burn the cities down. They aren't gonna burn any more cities."

As September wore on, a Nixon victory appeared to be a certainty. His campaign was running smoothly. Huge crowds greeted him wherever he went. He offended no one. He appeared confident and competent. Humphrey, on the other hand, was having trouble. His crowds were small and often hostile. In Boston, even while Senator Edward Kennedy and Mayor Kevin H. White accompanied him,

Humphrey was greeted with boos and with placards inscribed with antiwar slogans. He struggled to find a theme. It was difficult to know where he stood on the important issues. As a result, he appeared liberal to moderates, conservative to liberals, and moderate to no one. People even talked of the possibility that Wallace, as a third-Party candidate, might receive more votes than the Democrat.

When election day was only a month away, small signs of hope began to appear for the Democrats. They found that they had made a particularly shrewd choice for their Vice Presidential candidate. Edmund Muskie had quickly developed into a first-rate campaigner. He handled hostile crowds masterfully. Repeatedly he invited hecklers to the platform to speak their minds. He refused to lose his composure. His crowds grew, and their enthusiasm grew as well.

While Humphrey's Vice Presidential running mate was lifting the hopes of the Democrats, many Republicans began to regret their choice for Vice President. Spiro Agnew had put his foot into his mouth repeatedly. First he accused Humphrey of being "soft on Communism," a charge that offended Republicans and Democrats alike. Then he made an unfortunate reference to a reporter as a "fat Jap." Nixon, it seemed, continually was having to apologize for Agnew's remarks. Still, Nixon's lead seemed safe, although Humphrey had begun to cut into it.

Humphrey's advisers had been recommending that he clearly state his position on the Vietnam war. They urged him to declare his independence from the Johnson Administration on that issue. Eugene McCarthy's run for the nomination had demonstrated that much public sentiment against the war existed. Humphrey should declare

his intention to stop the bombing of North Vietnam if he became President. But Humphrey was still the Vice President of the United States. He hesitated to say anything in his campaign that might upset the talks that were then taking place in Paris, the talks that could produce an end to the war.

Finally, during a nationally televised speech on September 30th, Humphrey declared, "I would stop the bombing of the north as an acceptable risk for peace." Although later in that same speech he appeared to contradict that position, he had offered hope. He had begun, in the eyes of the voters, to become his own man, and he knew it. "I feel good inside for the first time," he stated.

Although Humphrey's hopes began to rise, Richard Nixon continued to maintain a comfortable lead in the opinion polls. In the meantime, George Wallace selected his Vice Presidential running mate, retired Air Force General Curtis E. LeMay. Until then, Wallace had virtually ignored foreign policy in his public statements, merely hinting that he would try for a military victory in Vietnam if the Paris talks failed. The choice of LeMay forced the foreign-policy issue on the Wallace campaign, for the General immediately made public statements that aroused new fears in those who heard him. He called the nuclear bomb "just another weapon" and laughed at America's "phobia about nuclear weapons." He hinted that a solution to the Vietnam problem was simple: he had once suggested bombing North Vietnam "back into the Stone Age." So while Wallace continued to deliver his "law and order" speeches, his audiences had reason to think twice.

The campaign slogged through October and into November without drama. Humphrey tried to lure Nixon into a debate; Nixon refused. George Wallace produced a 2,000-word document explaining his foreign policy. It sounded pretty much like the statements of the two major-Party candidates. The polls continued to give victory to Nixon, although as first Edward Kennedy and then Eugene McCarthy endorsed Humphrey, Nixon's margin continued to diminish. All three candidates publicly declared themselves winners; privately, all had their doubts.

By election day, Tuesday, November 5th, Nixon's once-insurmountable lead had dwindled to almost nothing. The polls were now predicting a very close election. Once again was raised the possibility of no candidate's winning a majority of the electoral votes. As the returns began to trickle in on Tuesday evening, the closeness of the race was confirmed. Nixon and Humphrey seemed to be taking turns in winning states. Wallace's success was limited to Southern states, where he won only Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia and Arkansas. But it seemed that enough voters in other states, who otherwise would have supported Richard Nixon, had voted for George Wallace to make the election a toss-up. By midnight of election eve, the outcome remained up in the air. By midmorning on Wednesday, even after California had finally swung to Nixon, he still needed Illinois to win. It wasn't until nearly noon on Wednesday that the results became clear: Richard Nixon was the President-elect. By the narrowest of margins, indeed, by less than a majority of the popular vote, Nixon had won.

Hubert Humphrey, in his concession speech, urged the nation to join forces in support of the man who would, in January, become the next President of the United States. "I have done my best," the Vice President said wearily. "I have lost. Mr. Nixon has won. The democratic process has worked its will. So let's get on with the urgent task of uniting this country."

Everybody knew what would happen next. The Electoral College would convene in December. The electors would cast their votes as tradition demanded: all electors from a given state would vote for the man who, in the November election, had received the most popular votes in that state. When the electoral voting had ended, Richard Nixon's victory would be official.

On January 20th, power officially changed hands. Richard Nixon stood on the steps of the Capitol building facing Chief Justice Earl Warren. His left hand resting on the two family Bibles held by his wife, his right hand raised, citizen Nixon repeated the oath of office that transformed him into President Nixon. As President Lyndon B. Johnson watched, he became private citizen Johnson.

The snows of New Hampshire, the bullets of California, the frenzy of Chicago, all were behind now. Power shifted hands quietly and peacefully, with dignity and order. The American political process had worked its will. The United States had a new President.

ED054018

SP001383

CHOOSING A PRESIDENT, 1968: THE AMERICAN POLITICAL PROCESS

TEACHERS' GUIDE

The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts 02155

CHOOSING A PRESIDENT, 1968: THE AMERICAN POLITICAL PROCESS

TEACHERS' GUIDE

The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts 02155

Copyright © The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs 1969
Tufts University

I. Objectives

A. Cognitive

1. Understanding of the qualities of a successful politician

2. Understanding of the role played by issues in an election

3. Understanding of the role of voters in an election

4. Understanding of the role of primary elections

5. Understanding of the role of party conventions

6. Understanding of how the Electoral College works

7. Understanding of the effect of opinion polls on election campaigns

8. Understanding of the role of bargaining among politicians

9. Knowledge of successful campaign techniques

B. Affective

1. Positive attitudes toward politicians and politics

2. Appreciation of the orderly and peaceful manner in which power changes hands in a democratic society

3. Appreciation of the power and responsibility of political office-holders

4. Interest in politics

C. Psychomotor

1. Participation as worker in a political campaign

2. Increased reading about politics in newspapers and magazines

3. Increased participation in school politics

II. Teaching Strategies

NOTE: During almost any school year, there is some form of election occurring locally, if not nationally. It is strongly suggested that any unit of study on politics be coordinated with the time of such an election.

A. Activities

Probably the best way for students to acquire an understanding of politics is for them to participate themselves in some way in the political process. You should encourage, or perhaps even require, your students to work for a candidate or a party in a local election. If possible, the entire class should be involved in such activities for various candidates and parties. They should share their experiences after the election. They may do this informally in class discussion or by written reports. The students might analyze the results of the election from the point of view of their own experiences.

In the absence of a city or town election, school elections may prove equally valuable. Elections for class officers or for student government provide a microcosm of politics and may actually offer students a greater spectrum of activities than an election in the community. The limits of such activities, of course, will be governed by the school regulations.

The following list suggests the kinds of political opportunities for individuals that exist during national, state, local, and even, in some cases, school elections.

1. Precinct work

    a. Preparing voter index cards and lists

    b. Making phone calls to get people to register and to vote

    c. House-to-house canvassing

    d. Recruiting party workers

    e. Providing transportation to the polls on election day

    f. Poll clerk

g. Registration clerk

h. Poll watcher

i. Registration watcher

j. Block captain

k. Precinct leader

2. Campaign work

a. Publicity

b. Public speaking

c. Arranging speaking engagements

d. Speech writing

e. Making phone calls to get people to register and to vote

f. Distributing literature

g. Planning and putting out mailings

h. Manning a sound truck

i. Preparing posters

j. Putting up posters

k. Designing and distributing buttons, bumper stickers, etc.

l. Buying time and space in advertising media

m. Research

n. Legal work

o. Filing

p. Typing

3. Meetings, rallies, social events

    a. Planning programs

    b. Planning and running money-raising affairs

    c. Acting as master of ceremonies

    d. Ticket selling

    e. Bookkeeping

    f. Planning and running a rally

    g. Making decorations

    h. Organizing parades

    i. Obtaining speakers

    j. Briefing speakers

    k. Escorting speakers to meeting places

4. Advanced work

    a. Ward chairman or leader

    b. Town chairman or leader

    c. County chairman or leader

    d. Campaign manager

    e. Finance chairman, publicity chairman, etc.

    f. Serving in an appointive office

    g. Being a candidate for office

B. Field Trips

Field trips provide valuable learning experiences for students if they are adequately prepared in advance. The group must know what to look for and the reasons for taking that particular trip. You should devote a class period to explaining where the students will visit, what they might expect to see, what they should look for especially, and what sorts of questions will be discussed after the trip. Afterward, at least one class period should be reserved for discussing the trip.

Examples of objectives for field trips are:

1. A local party headquarters
2. State legislature
3. Town meeting
4. Political rally
5. Speech by a politician

C. Classroom Activities

1. Have each student keep a "diary" or scrapbook of the activities of one candidate of his choice. This might include newspaper and magazine articles and reports of the activities of the candidate, pictures, speeches, and the student's own analysis of the candidate's campaign.

2. Invite local politicians to class. They might discuss informally with the students either issues of relevance to their campaign or the techniques of campaigning and tactical problems faced by politicians.

3. The class might arrange a formal debate among local politicians contending for the same office. Such a debate could be presented before the entire school.

4. Show and discuss the films "Practical Politics," available from the Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs. Each of these four brief films dramatizes a problem the politician is likely to face and is open-ended, leaving the dilemma

unresolved. The films are accompanied by a Teachers' Guide that includes discussion questions.

5. Organize a school-wide mock convention. The students should decide such questions as: how delegates are to be selected; whether there will be primary elections; how convention officials are to be chosen; how the rules of the convention are to be created; how the committees (the Platform Committee, the Credentials Committee, etc.) are to be determined; and when and where the convention is to take place.

6. Have the class conduct an opinion poll on an upcoming election either in the community or in the school. The students should help to draw up the questionnaire to be administered, decide on sampling techniques, administer the questionnaire, tabulate the responses, and analyze the results.

D. Research Projects

1. Students, either individually or in groups, can write narratives on Presidential elections from the past.

2. Students may write position papers on topics such as the following:

   a. The value of Presidential primary elections

   b. Electoral College reform

   c. The role of party conventions

   d. The role of third parties

   e. Politicians' use of appointive offices

   f. Conflict-of-interest regulations

   g. The role of the party "machine"

   h. Regulation of campaigning expenses

3. Students may make comparative studies of political processes in other countries. Of particular interest are the systems of Britain, the Soviet Union, Spain, Hungary, and any of the new African states.

E. Interviewing

Have students interview local political leaders, such as precinct leaders, campaign managers, party chairmen, or candidates. The following ground rules should generally be followed during such interviews:

1. Prepare a list of questions beforehand.

2. Decide who will be responsible for asking the questions.

3. Remember the following points:

   a. No arguments over issues.

   b. No personal attacks.

   c. No embarrassing questions.

   d. The purpose is to ask questions and to listen.

   e. Do not use the interview to express your own views.

The following questions, suitable for an interview with a precinct leader, can easily be adapted for interviews with other political leaders:

1. Do you have a coleader? Do you have other workers helping you?

2. What does a precinct leader do? What are your responsibilities?

3. How large is the precinct? What area does it cover? How many voters does it contain?

4. How are precinct leaders selected?

5. Do you keep a year-by-year record of the votes in the precinct? How did your party do during the last election? How do you explain your success or failure?

6. If you could get all the help you needed, how many people could you use to help with the work in the precinct? Can high school students help? What kinds of jobs can they do?

III. Discussion Questions

A. Questions on the reading

1. Why did Governor Romney feel that it was important to win in New Hampshire?

2. What is the function of a primary election?

3. Compare the strategies of Romney and Nixon in their efforts to win the New Hampshire primary.

4. What advantages as a candidate did Nixon have over Romney?

5. If you were a New Hampshire voter in 1968, what choices would you have in the primary election?

6. What is a "write-in candidate"?

7. Compare the appeal to the voters of Senator McCarthy and President Johnson.

8. What is the relationship between a primary election and a party convention?

9. Why do you think Governor Romney quit the campaign?

10. Why do you think Governor Rockefeller refused to announce his candidacy?

11. What was the significance of Mr. Nixon's victory in New Hampshire?

12. Explain the reason for the results of the Democratic primary in New Hampshire.

13. Why was Senator McCarthy's 42% of the popular vote in New Hampshire considered a major victory for him?

14. Why did Senator Robert Kennedy decide to enter the Presidential race?

15. What was the effect of Nixon's showing in New Hampshire on other possible Republican candidates?

16. What was the significance of President Johnson's television announcement on March 31st?

17. What advantages and disadvantages did Vice President Humphrey have compared to the other candidates for the Democratic nomination?

18. What purposes are served by opinion polls?

19. "A vote for Volpe . . . was a vote for Richard Nixon." Explain.

20. What was the significance of Governor Rockefeller's victory in Massachusetts?

21. What was the significance of the Indiana primary for the Democrats?

22. What was the significance of Senator McCarthy's victory in Oregon?

23. Why was the California primary considered so important?

24. What effect did Robert Kennedy's assassination have on political events?

25. What is the function of a party convention?

26. Describe how a convention works.

27. What is the function of a Platform Committee?

28. By what different means do delegates to a convention decide for whom they will vote?

29. Explain Nixon's victory in Miami.

30. Why do you think Mr. Nixon chose Governor Agnew as his running mate?

31. Why will a party convention obediently nominate as its Vice-Presidential candidate whomever the Presidential nominee chooses?

32. Summarize the major issues that Nixon discussed in his acceptance speech.

33. What do you feel was the general effect of Nixon's acceptance speech?

34. Why did many people expect excitement at the Democratic convention in Chicago?

35. What was the significance of the debate on the Democratic platform?

36. Explain Vice President Humphrey's victory.

37. Why do you think Senator Muskie was selected as the Democrats' Vice-Presidential candidate?

38. What was the effect of the events in Chicago on the Democratic Party?

39. Explain the appeal of George Wallace to voters.

40. What is a third party?

41. Explain how the Humphrey-Muskie ticket began to cut into the early lead of the Nixon-Agnew ticket.

42. What was the significance of General Curtis LeMay's being selected as Wallace's running mate?

43. Explain Mr. Nixon's victory in the general election.

44. How does the Electoral College system work?

45. How could Nixon win the election if he did not win a majority of the popular votes?

B. Questions on local party organization

1. Are precincts provided for by law or by party rules in your state?

2. What are they called (if other than precincts)?

3. Are there formally designated precinct leaders?

4. What are they called?

5. How does a precinct leader get his job? By election? By appointment? How does a town committee chairman get his job? A state chairman?

6. Who elects in each case? Who appoints?

7. What is the term of office of:

   a. a precinct leader?

   b. a town committee chairman?

   c. a state committee chairman?

8. How are vacancies in the leadership filled?

9. Do party committees on any level (precinct, town or city, county, state, or national) endorse, recommend, or nominate candidates for any office in your state?

10. Do the state election laws or party rules define the job of precinct leader, town committee chairman, county committee chairman, or state committee chairman, its responsibilities and powers? If so, summarize.

11. What are the relationships of:

    a. a ward (or precinct) committee to a town or city committee?

    b. a town or city committee to a county committee?

    c. a county committee to a state committee?

    d. a county committee to other county committees?

    e. a state committee to a national committee?

12. What political party clubs are there in your town? What state-wide party clubs are there? What role do these clubs play?

13. Does your state have state-wide political conventions? How often? For what purpose? How are the delegates selected?

14. Do precinct, city, county, or state committees have paid staffs? If so, what paid staff members are there? What are their duties?

15. How are the members of a state committee selected? Of a national committee?

16. How many delegates to the next national conventions of the two major Parties will there be from your state?

17. How are the district delegates to a national convention and the delegates at large selected?

18. Does your state have a Presidential preferential primary before the national conventions in either or both Parties?

19. Are such primaries advisory or binding? State the conditions.

C. Questions on local party leadership

1. Is there an acknowledged party leader in your neighborhood?

2. Is there an acknowledged party leader in your community?

3. Are there recognized party factions in your community?

4. Who are reputed to be the faction leaders?

5. Who gets out the vote on election day or primary day?

6. Who mans the polling places?

7. How are poll workers selected?

D. Questions on nominating procedures

1. How is the candidate for each elective municipal office in your state nominated? For each elective county office? For each elective state-wide office?

2. Which, if any, of the following processes of party endorsement or nomination are used in your state, county, and municipality:

a. Caucus?

b. Convention?

c. Party primary?

d. Run-off primary?

3. Explain how the above processes work and for what offices each method is used.

E. Questions on the conduct of primary elections

1. Who may vote?

2. What party or government organization staffs the polling places and supervises the election?

3. When are the primary elections, caucuses, or conventions held? Who sets the date?

4. Is the date set each year? Is it the same every year?

5. How does a candidate get on the ballot?

6. Who judges whether a contested voter may cast his ballot?

F. Questions on the conduct of general elections

1. Who may vote?

2. When is the election held?

3. What governmental organizations supervise and staff the polling places?

4. What are the registration requirements in your state?

5. Is there a poll tax or other special qualification for the right to vote?

IV. Vocabulary

The following is a list of words in the narrative which have special meanings in the study of politics. Encourage your students to learn how these words are properly used. This may be done, in most cases, by careful examination of their context in the narrative. There may be other words in the text with which the students are not familiar and which are not listed here. The students should be able, however, to understand most of these words from context.

political party	nominee	partisan
Democratic Party	party convention	party platform
Republican Party	ballot	running mate
third party	reelection	politician
major party	opinion poll	administration
candidate	write-in vote	foreign policy
candidacy	campaign	issue
noncandidate	rank-and-file	electoral votes
primary election	incumbent	elector
Presidential election	liberal	Electoral College
delegate	conservative	petition
delegation	moderate	President-elect
nominate	draft	majority
nomination	minority group	

V. Resources

A. Books

Baldwin, Raymond E., Let's Go into Politics. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952

A down-to-earth study of politics at the local level.

Binkley, Wilfred E., American Political Parties: Their Natural History. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1958

A classic study of the evolution of American political politics.

Brogan, D. W., Politics in America. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955

The American political process from a perceptive Englishman's point of view.

Burdette, Franklin L. (ed.), Readings for Republicans (Docket Series, Volume 14). New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1960

The philosophy of the Republican Party in the words of some of its leaders, from Lincoln's analysis to Eisenhower's statements of basic principles.

Campbell, Angus; Gerald Gurin; and Warren E. Miller, The Voter Decides. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson & Company, 1960

A scientific study from the University of Michigan Research Center of voting behavior in the 1952 election. Points out the roles of parties, issues, and candidates in deciding the outcome of elections.

Cotter, David L., The Fabulous Democrats. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1956

A history of the Democratic Party.

Farley, James A., Behind the Ballots. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1938

The political biography of the former Democratic National Chairman and campaign manager for Franklin D. Roosevelt. Contains insights into political problems in the early part of Mr. Farley's political career, the 1920's and 1930's.

Flynn, Edward J., You're the Boss. New York: The Viking Press, Inc., 1947

The political biography of "Boss" Flynn, former Democratic Chiarman of Bronx County, New York, and former Democratic National Chairman. An analysis of political "facts of life" and the practical problems of a political leader.

Hinderaker, Ivan, Party Politics. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1956

An introductory text on political parties that defines fundamental terms; discusses party organization on all levels, the Presidential role in the party, and themes revolving around the history of parties; reviews campaign tactics and organizational problems.

Kent, Frank, The Great Game of Politics. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1924

A presentation of the elementary human facts about politics, politicians, political machines, and candidates.

Key, V. O., Jr., Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups, 4th edition. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1958

Reviews the political party system and organization and the parties' relation to government.

Merriam, C. E., and H. F. Gosnell, The American Party System. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949

An introduction to the study of political parties in the United States.

Merriam, Robert E., and Rachel M. Goetz, Going into Politics: A Guide for Citizens. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957

A guide for citizen activity in politics, with emphasis on the necessity for work within existing political parties.

Michener, James A., Report of the County Chairman. New York: Random House, 1961

Novelist James Michener, who served as Chairman of the Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Citizens for Kennedy Committee, tells the story of the 1960 Presidential campaign from the precinct level.

Nash, Howard P., Third Parties in American Politics. New York: Public Affairs Committee, 1958

A history since 1827, including many photographs and cartoons.

O'Connor, Edwin, The Last Hurrah. Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1956

A novel whose central figure, an old-time political boss, is vividly characterized.

Patterson, Franklin (ed.), Practical Political Action: A Guide for Young Citizens. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962

Case studies designed to provoke discussion among students about politics at the grass-roots level. Adapted by the Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs from materials developed by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Reed, Edward A. (ed.), Readings for Democrats (Docket Series, Volume 15). New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1960

Statements of Democratic leaders giving a portrait of the Democratic Party from its beginnings under Thomas Jefferson to the election year of 1960.

Rossiter, Clinton, Parties and Politics in America. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1960

An objective analysis of our two major Parties.

Scott, Andrew M., and Earl Wallace, Politics, U.S.A.: Cases on the American Democratic Process. The Macmillan Company, 1961

Case studies of political action.

Van Riper, P. P., Handbook of Practical Politics. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1960

A guide to political activity on the local level.

White, Theodore H., The Making of the President--1960. New York: Atheneum Publishers, 1961

White, Theodore H., The Making of the President--1964. New York: Atheneum Publishers, 1965

Narrative histories of American politics in action. The stories of the Presidential campaigning of 1960 and 1964 told by a journalist who traveled with the candidates.

B. Commercial Films

1. "Advise and Consent" (139 minutes, b/w) Ideal Pictures

The political and personal struggle for power on Capitol Hill are depicted with compelling honesty and shocking candor. The story, filmed in the actual locales in Washington, D.C., centers around the bitter conflicts set in motion when the President of the United States asks the Senate to confirm his controversial choice for Secretary of State.

2. "All the King's Men" (109 minutes, b/w) Ideal Pictures

   Willie Stark is the "man of the people," the man who made the headlines--the man who inaugurated an administration of violent, vicious and wreckless corruption.

3. "The Great Man Votes" (70 minutes, b/w) Brandon Films, Inc.

   Off-beat story of the importance of the individual in the democratic way of life.

4. "The Last Hurrah" (121 minutes, b/w) Ideal Pictures

   From the pages of Edwin O'Connor's best seller has come the saga of Mayor Frank Skeffington, long-time political boss of a big city--the shrewd, flamboyant, lovable and witty Irishman who made a city and state his own.

5. "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington" (130 minutes, b/w) Ideal Pictures

   An idealistic young Senator tangles with a political machine.

6. "Viva, Zapata!" (113 minutes, b/w) Brandon Films, Inc.

   Mexican leader Zapata's struggle to overthrow Diaz's dictatorship.

D. Educational and Documentary Films

1. "Broadening the Base" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

   Examines the broadening of the base of consent and the increasing democratization of the political system in the United States.

2. "Characteristics of the Electorate" (20 minutes, b/w) Modern Learning Aids

   Dr. Claude Robinson, Chairman of the Board, Opinion Research Corporation, analyzes the political composition and behavior of the American electorate.

3. "The Court and Politics" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

   Analyzes the relationship between politics and the Supreme Court.

4. "EES-IPP and the Voter" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

   Summarizes research findings about the factors which affect voting behavior.

5. "The Electoral College" (25 minutes, b/w) Carousel Films, Inc.

   Discusses the adequacy and inadequacy of the Electoral College system. Records the Electoral College vote in Hawaii, Louisiana, Mississippi, California, New York and Illinois. Tells the views of some Senators.

6. "The Electoral College" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

   Reviews criticisms of the Electoral College and proposals for Electoral College reform.

7. "The Electorate Tides of the Future" (20 minutes, b/w) Modern Learning Aids

   Samuel Lubell, author, analyst and columnist, discusses the broad sociological changes taking place in our society and their importance to American politics.

8. "The Engineering of Consent" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

   Analyzes the value of Presidential election campaigns.

9. "Geography and Politics" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

   Tells how the United States' physical environment has influenced its political life and institutions.

10. "Getting into Local Politics" (20 minutes, b/w) Modern Learning Aids

    Dr. Norton Long, Professor of Political Science, Northwestern University, discusses political participation at the local level.

11. "The Grand Alliance" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Reviews the history of the shifting alliances of the organized interest groups which compose the two major political Parties.

12. "How Our Two Party System Operates" (20 minutes, b/w) Modern Learning Aids

    Dr. Alfred De Grazia, Professor of Government, New York University, describes the key functions which political parties perform in our democratic system.

13. "How We Elect Our Presidents" (10 minutes, color and b/w) Birad Corporation

    Describes the process involved in electing Presidents. Discusses national conventions, platforms, nominations, roll call, election-day events and the Electoral College.

14. "How We Elect Our Representatives" (11 minutes, b/w) Coronet Films

    Shows that the functional basis of our democracy is the electoral system. Discusses registration, primary and general elections, the impact of television on campaigns, and the use of voting machines.

15. "Local Government and Politics" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Examines the need to reexamine the functions and organization of local government.

16. "The Making of a President" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Theodore H. White, Pulitzer prize-winning author, discusses the making of a United States President.

17. "The Making of a President--1960, Part 1, The Battle for the Nomination" (42 minutes, b/w) Xerox Corporation

    Depicts the campaign for nomination to the Presidency during the year 1960.

18. "The Making of a President--1960, Part 2, The Battle for the Presidency" (39 minutes, b/w) Xerox Corporation

    Depicts the campaign and political struggle involved in the election to the Presidency in 1960.

19. "The Meaning of Elections" (11 minutes, b/w) Coronet Films

    Describes the relationship of the elected official to his constituency, the operation of election machinery, and the effect of voting. Relates the concept of equality to democratic elections. Shows the need for constant improvement in electoral systems.

20. "The Myth of Tweedledee and Tweedledum" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Examines the diversity within the Democratic and Republican Parties in the United States as well as the differences and similarities between them.

21. "The Nineteen Sixty-Four Conventions--Goldwater, Johnson Nominated" (20 minutes, b/w) Hearst Metrotone News

    Shows democracy in action at the 1964 Democratic and Republican national conventions, where Goldwater and Johnson and their running mates were nominated.

22. "Nominations" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Evaluates the nominating process and the primary system in United States elections.

23. "Party Organization" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Reviews the hierarchial structure of the national parties, with emphasis on national committees and party bosses.

24. "Party Politics and Party Organizations" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Paul Butler and Leonard Hall, former chairmen of the Democratic and Republican national committees, discuss party politics and party organizations.

25. "Party Systems" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Examines multiple-party systems, two-party systems, and one-party systems.

26. "The People's Choice" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Discusses what President Kennedy's election revealed about American voting trends.

27. "Political Parties" (11 minutes, b/w) Coronet Films

    Shows the relationship of political parties to the individual and shows that the institution of parties is dependent upon popular approval. The importance of party mechanics and the way parties keep good will are illustrated. The relationship of local party activities to national measures and democratic voting procedures is explained.

28. "Political Parties" (18 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Explains how political parties are organized and operated, emphasizing the role of an opposition party. Dramatizes a series of situations which show how the parties give citizens an opportunity to participate in government by nominating candidates and promoting programs.

29. "Political Parties and the Process of Government" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Examines the relationship between the American political party system and the governmental system in which it operates.

30. "Politics--The High Cost of Conviction" (5 minutes, color) International Film Bureau

    Questions whether a successful business man has the obligation to endorse publicly a senatorial candidate whom he considers to be the "best man," even though such endorsement may adversely affect his business.

31. "Politics and Elections" (20 minutes, b/w) Progressive Pictures

    Shows how a citizen can become a candidate for a governmental office and considers his possibilities of becoming elected.

32. "Polling the Public" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Explains how public opinion is measured.

33. "Practical Politics" (Four films, 20 minutes each, b/w) Lincoln Filene Center

    Four open-ended case studies to encourage students to discuss problems faced by a candidate for public office. A Teachers' Guide is included.

34. "Presidential Elections" (15 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Describes the process of electing a President of the United States. Analyzes the structure and strategy of campaign organizations and the major political moves involved in the nomination and election of a President.

35. "Right Now" (29 minutes, color) Brandon Films

    A documentary showing voter-education campaigns in Savannah, Georgia, to persuade Negroes to register.

36. "The Right to Vote" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Discusses American voting rights and suffrage problems, especially those concerning the disfranchisement of the Negro.

37. "Smoke-Filled Rooms and Dark Horses" (30 minutes, b/w) Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

    Describes and analyzes the role of organizations and national party conventions.

38. "Someone Must Govern Us" (60 minutes, b/w) Indiana University

    Examines and contrasts the political systems of the United States and the United Kingdom.

39. "The Story of a Congressman" (25 minutes, b/w) Sterling Educational Films

    Follows the activities of a Congressman during his reelection campaign. Discussions between the incumbent and his opponent emphasize that the strength of a free government lies in an intelligent voting public.

40. "Ticket to Freedom" (14 minutes, b/w) Ford Motor Company Motion Pictures

    Exposes the poor voting records of the past, explores many of the common excuses for not voting, and outlines a four-point program for every voter to defend his basic freedoms.

41. "Tippecanoe and Lyndon Too" (24 minutes, color) McGraw-Hill Textfilms

    Demonstrates the changes in Presidential election campaigns since Washington's day.

42. "The True Story of an Election, Part 1" (30 minutes, color) Coronet Films

    Discusses a primary election. Shows problems of financing and organizing the general election, precinct work, publicity, and clashes between candidates.

43. "The True Story of an Election, Part 2" (26 minutes, color) Coronet Films

    Follows campaign efforts in the precincts--publicity, last-minute strategy, and opinion polling. Shows election day until the polls close. Depicts victory, defeat and post-election activities of both sides.

44. "Tuesday in November" (22 minutes, b/w) Du Art Film Labs, Inc.

    Portrays the 1944 Presidential election from the nominating convention to election day in November. Explains the organization and structure of government in the United States.

45. "United States Elections--How We Vote" (14 minutes, color) Film Association of California

    Introduces the process by which citizens vote and shows the election workers who make free and fair elections possible. Explains that citizens must register in advance.

46. "Voting Procedures" (14 minutes, b/w) Indiana University

    Describes the qualifications and procedures of registration and voting. Distinguishes between "split ticket" and "straight ticket" voting methods. Explains the importance of a secret ballot. Shows a primary and a general election.

47. "Waging a Campaign and Winning an Election" (20 minutes, b/w) Modern Learning Aids

    Robert Humphreys, former campaign director for the Republican National Committee, shows how campaign strategy is developed.

48. "Where Were You" (28 minutes, b/w) Ford Motor Company Motion Pictures

    Describes how political parties choose candidates, nominate through primaries, and campaign for election. Prepared during the 1960 Presidential election year.

49. "Why Politics" (20 minutes, b/w) Modern Learning Aids

    Raymond Moley, journalist, author and political scientist, discusses our need for political information and knowledge of government.

50. "The Women Get the Vote" (27 minutes, b/w) McGraw-Hill Textfilms

    Traces the campaign of the suffragettes from the meeting in Seneca Falls in 1848 to discuss the rights of women to the passage of the 19th Amendment to the United States Constitution in 1920.